

on the same basis. Since labor organizations have an affirmative duty to comply with all reasonable requests of any candidate to distribute campaign literature (at the candidate's expense), a union rule refusing all such distributions would not be proper, even though applied in a nondiscriminatory fashion. In view of the fact that expenses of distribution are to be borne by the candidate a labor organization may not refuse to distribute campaign literature merely because it may have a small staff which cannot handle such distribution for all candidates. If this is the case, the organization may employ additional temporary staff or contract the job to a professional mailer and charge the expense incurred to the candidates for whom the service is being rendered. The organization may require candidates to tender in advance the estimated costs of distributing their literature, if such requirement is applied uniformly.

#### **§ 452.70 Contents of literature.**

The Act does not and unions may not regulate the contents of campaign literature which candidates may wish to have distributed by the union. This is left to the discretion of each candidate. The labor organization may not require that it be permitted to read a copy of the literature before it is sent out, nor may it censor the statements of the candidates in any way, even though the statement may include derogatory remarks about other candidates. Furthermore, a union's contention that mailing of certain campaign literature may constitute libel for which it may be sued has been held not to justify its refusal to distribute the literature, since the union is under a statutory duty to distribute the material.<sup>37</sup>

#### **§ 452.71 Inspection of membership lists.**

(a) Each bona fide candidate for office has a right, once within 30 days prior to any election in which he is a candidate, to inspect a list containing the names and last known addresses of

all members of the labor organization who are subject to a collective bargaining agreement requiring membership therein as a condition of employment. The right of inspection does not include the right to copy the list but does include the right to compare it with a personal list of members. It is the intent of the Act that such membership lists be made available for inspection at the candidates' option any time within the 30-day period. The list is not required to be maintained continuously and may be compiled immediately before each election. The form in which the list is to be maintained is not specified by the Act. Thus, a card index system may satisfy the requirements of the Act. The list may be organized alphabetically or geographically, or by local in a national or international labor organization.

(b) It is the duty of the labor organization and its officers to refrain from discrimination in favor of or against any candidate with respect to the use of lists of members. Thus, if a union permits any candidate to use such lists in any way other than the right of inspection granted by the Act, it must inform all candidates of the availability of the list for that purpose and accord the same privilege to all candidates who request it. Such privileges may include permitting inspection of the list where members are not subject to a collective bargaining agreement requiring membership as a condition of employment, inspecting the list more than once, or copying the list.

[38 FR 18324, July 9, 1973, as amended at 50 FR 31311, Aug. 1, 1985]

#### **§ 452.72 Period of inspection.**

The Act specifies the maximum period during which the right of inspection of membership lists is to be granted. The opportunity to inspect the lists must be granted once during the 30-day period prior to the casting of ballots in the election. Thus, where a mail ballot system is employed under which ballots are returnable as soon as received by members, the right to inspect must be accorded within the 30-day period prior to the mailing of the ballots to members. It would be an unreasonable restriction to permit inspection of lists

<sup>37</sup>See *Philo v. Stellato*, (E.D. Mich. Civil No. 21244, May 24, 1961); *Ansley v. Fulco*, (Calif. Ct. of Appeal, First App. District, Div. Three, 1 Civil No. 29483, May 31, 1972).